

THE STRUCTURE OF A SYMPLECTIC MANIFOLD ON THE SPACE OF LOOPS OF 7-MANIFOLD

MICHAEL MOVSHEV

ABSTRACT. We define a symplectic structure on the space of non parametrized loops in G_2 manifold. We also develop some basics of intersection theory of Lagrangian submanifolds.

1. CONSTRUCTION OF SYMPLECTIC STRUCTURE

1.1. The transgression map. There is a remarkable map described in [1] which relates de Rham complex on finite dimensional manifold M with de Rham complex of its free loop space $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$:

$$T : \Omega^*(M) \rightarrow \Omega^{*-1}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})) \quad (1)$$

The map T is integration of a form along a path $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$. The main feature of this map is that it is a complex morphism. In particular it maps closed forms into closed. Observe that $Diff(S^1)^+$ acts on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ via reparametrization of a loop. It is clear that the image of T contains in $Diff(S^1)^+$ invariant forms. We want to employ T to construct symplectic forms on the quotient $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ by the action of the group.

1.2. Definition of the space of the singular knots. Following [1] we denote $\tilde{X}$ the subspace in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ formed by immersions γ which have the properties that γ induces an embedding of $S^1 \setminus A$, for A finite subset of S^1 , and that for any two distinct points x_1, x_2 of A , the branches of γ at $\gamma(x_1)$ and $\gamma(x_2)$ have tangency of at most of finite order. The group $Diff(S^1)^+$ acts freely on it. We denote the quotient by $\tilde{Y}$.

Following [1] we identify a tangent space to a singular knot γ with the space of sections of the normal bundle $N(\gamma)$ to γ .

1.3. The symplectic structure. Denote λ a closed 3-form on M . $\omega = T(\lambda)$ a closed 2-form on $\tilde{Y}$. To be more explicit we give a formula for it. Let x, y be two tangent vectors to $\gamma \in \tilde{Y}$. We identify them with sections of the normal bundle. The one form $\lambda(., x, y)$ is defined on γ . Then

$$\omega(x, y) = \oint_{\gamma} \lambda(*, x, y) \quad (2)$$

We state without a proof the following simple

Proposition 1. *The form ω has no kernel iff λ satisfies some condition. This condition is purely local and must be fulfilled at any tangent space. Fix a tangent space T_x to x . The form $\lambda(l, \cdot, \cdot)$ contains l in its kernel for any tangent vector l . The condition is that the kernel must be one dimensional for any l .*

The following lemma can be found in [2]. We denote by the same letter restriction of λ to some tangent space where it becomes a form with constant coefficients. The lemma gives a characterization of possible λ .

Lemma 1. 1) *The forms in question exist in dimensions 3 and 7.*

2) *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a noncommutative algebra with division over $\mathbb{R}$. The imaginary part $\text{Im}(\mathbb{A})$ of $\mathbb{A}$ is closed under commutator. Let $(\cdot, \cdot)$ be a natural dot-product on $\mathbb{A}$. Consider on $\text{Im}(\mathbb{A})$ a form $([a, b], c)$, ($[a, b]$ is a commutator). Then $\lambda(a, b, c)$ is linearly equivalent to a multiple of $([a, b], c)$.*

When dimension of the linear space is 3, λ is up to a constant a volume form. In dimension 7 we should start with Cayley numbers and follow the recipe of the lemma.

It is clear that a space $\tilde{Y}$ for 3-manifold, equipped with a volume form bears a symplectic structure.

The existence of form λ on 7-manifold gives restrictions on the structure group of the tangent bundle.

Lemma 2. [2] *The group of automorphisms of λ in 7 dimensions is G_2 .*

Now it should be clear how to construct such forms. Pick a Riemannian 7 dimensional manifold with a holonomy $i\ G \subseteq G_2$. Then, making a parallel transport via connection of a form defined over one tangent space, we build a globally defined, closed form λ .

1.4. Reconstruction of Cayley algebra from tensor λ . According to [2] all Cayley algebra can be recovered from tensor λ . Here a short sketch how he does it.

We know that Cayley numbers $\mathbb{O}$ are equipped with canonical anti-involution, trace and a dot product. By definition $\text{Im}\mathbb{O} = \{l \in \mathbb{O}; \bar{l} = -l\}$. Here $\bar{\cdot}$ is antiinvolution. Then $\text{tr}(l) = 1/2(l + \bar{l})$, $(l, m) = \text{tr}(l * \bar{m})$ and $\lambda(a, b, c) = ([a, b], c)$. To recover $[\cdot, \cdot]$ from λ we have to know a dot product. Define a linear map $\mathbb{R}^7 \otimes \mathbb{R}^7 \rightarrow \Lambda^7((\mathbb{R}^7)^*)$ by the formula $m \otimes n \rightarrow \lambda(n, \cdot, \cdot) \wedge \lambda(n, \cdot, \cdot) \wedge \lambda$. This defines a conformal class of a metric. To fix a concrete representative we chose it satisfying

$$[m, [m, n]] = -(m, m)n + (m, n)m \quad (3)$$

1.5. A simple observation. Denote as usual TM a tangent bundle of a manifold M . Denote the compliment of the zero section in TM by $T^0(M)$. Let $p: T^0(M) \rightarrow M$ be a natural projection. Let p^*T be the pullback of the tangent bundle. It contains a tautological subbundle O . We denote by I the quotient p^*T/O . Every element γ of $\tilde{X}$ defines a map $\dot{\gamma}: S^1 \rightarrow T^0(M)$. We can identify canonically the tangent space to γ in $\tilde{Y}$ with sections of the pullback γ^*I .

It is clear that I in case of 3 dimensional Riemannian manifold and G_2 manifold is a symplectic bundle. The symplectic structure inherits from the 3-form. More precisely we pullback the form λ on $T^0(M)$. $T^0(M)$ admits a nonvanishing

vector field e : a generator of dilatations along the fibers of the projection. This field is a basis of O . We plug e into λ . The result is a nondegenerate form ω on I .

Acting the same way we can define a complex structure on I . In 3 dimensional case we pick a Riemannian metric, whose volume form is λ . In 7 dimensions according to 1.4 we have some canonical Riemannian metric. In both cases we have a vector product $[\cdot, \cdot]$ at hand. Denote the normalization of e by e_0 and identify I with orthogonal compliment to e . Define a complex structure on I via the formula $J(\cdot) = [e_0, \cdot]$. The identity $J^2 = -Id$ is a corollary of 3 and a similar identity, which holds in 3 dimensions.

We want to bring to your attention a fact that symplectic, Riemannian and complex structure on I are compatible in a sense that $\omega(\cdot, \cdot) = (J, \cdot)$

2. SOME TOPOLOGICAL COMPUTATIONS

Let I be a complex bundle, defined in 1.5.

Lemma 3. *The first Chern class of I , defined over the base $T^0(M)$ (M is 3 dimensional) is divisible by 2.*

Proof. We use the fact that the tangent bundle of an oriented 3 manifold is parallelizable. We replace T^0M by the a homotopy equivalent to it spherical bundle $S(M)$. The spherical bundle $S(M)$ is trivial. Denote trivializing projection $S(M) \rightarrow S^2$ by q . The bundle I is isomorphic to the pullback $q^*(T(S^2))$ of the tangent bundle $T(S^2)$ of S^2 . This being said the claim about Chern class becomes trivial. $\square$

We want to have a similar information about G_2 manifold M^7 . The spherical bundle over M^7 also has a complex bundle I on it. I again can be identified with a subbundle of tangent bundle of $S(M)$ consisting of vectors tangent to fibers of projection $p : S(M) \rightarrow M$.

Lemma 4. *The first Chern class of I over $T^0(M^7)$ is zero.*

Proof. As before we replace $T^0(M^7)$ by the spherical bundle $S(M)$. We already mentioned that I is the tangent bundle to the fibers of projection $p : S(M) \rightarrow M$. We want to show that the top wedge power $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^3(I)$ has a nonvanishing section.

A sphere S^6 is G_2 homogeneous space. with stabilizer of a point being equal to $SU(3)$. $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^3(T(S^6))$ must contain a G_2 invariant nonzero section. It gives rise to a never vanishing section of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{C}}^3(I)$. $\square$

3. LAGRANGIAN SUBMANIFOLDS IN $\tilde{Y}$

In [1] some examples of Lagrangian submanifolds were proposed. Namely take $L\Sigma$ be a set of all loops containing in the embedded two dimensional surface $\Sigma \subset M^3$. In [1] it was proved that it is a Lagrangian submanifold of $\tilde{Y}$.

In G_2 setting the role of hypersurfaces is played by isotropic submanifolds, in other words embedded 4-manifolds, the restriction of form λ on whose is equal to zero identically.

3.1. Isotropic subspaces. We will need some information on linear subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^7$, the restriction of tensor λ on whose vanishes identically. We call such subspace isotropic.

Lemma 5. 1) *The dimension of maximal isotropic subspace is 4.*

2) *The group G_2 acts transitively on the set of isotropic subspaces.*

3) *The stabilizer of isotropic 4-plane is $SO(4)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $\lambda(a, b, c) = ([a, b], c)$, where commutator and dot product are taken in Cayley numbers. Take a nonzero vector from a maximal isotropic subspace L and call it $\mathbf{i}$. Take any vector in orthogonal complement to $\mathbf{i}$ and call it $\mathbf{j}$. Obviously $[\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}] \perp \mathbf{L}$, otherwise the restriction of λ on L would be nonzero. Let us call $\mathbf{k}$ the Cayley vector product $[\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}]$. Pick any vector in the orthogonal complement to $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}$ in L . We call it $\mathbf{l}$. It is clear that $\lambda|_{\langle \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{l} \rangle} \equiv 0$. We are claiming that $[\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}] \in \mathbf{L}$ because L is maximal isotropic. Obviously λ remains to be identically zero on the space $\langle \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{l}, [\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}] \rangle$. If L contained some other vector than $[\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}]$, orthogonal to $\langle \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{l} \rangle$, then by simple reasonings $\lambda|_L \neq 0$. It is also clear that we can add no more vectors to enlarge L . This proves first assertion.

If we normalize vectors $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}, [\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{l}], [\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{l}], [\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}]\}$, then in each such a basis multiplication in $\mathbb{O}$ is given by the same structure constants. A linear transformation that carries one such a basis into another is an automorphism of $\mathbb{O}$ and hence is in G_2 . The above basis is a function of $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{l}$. This implies that G_2 acts transitively on triples $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{l}$ and therefor on isotropic subspaces. This proves the second assertion.

It is clear that the stabilizer $\text{St}(L)$ acts transitively and free on the space of triples of orthogonal vectors in L . It identifies $\text{St}(L)$ with $SO(4)$. $\square$

Proposition 2. *Let Σ be immersed isotropic submanifold. The set $L(\Sigma)$ of loops containing in Σ is a Lagrangian submanifold.*

Proof. It is clear that the restriction of symplectic form ω on $L(\Sigma)$ is zero. Choose a parametrization of a curve $\gamma \in \tilde{Y}$. The tangent space to γ is identified with sections of normal bundle to γ . The subspace of tangent space, tangent to $L(\Sigma)$ is the space of normal bundle in Σ . Then it is clear that any vector, orthogonal in a sense of ω to sections of normal bundle in $L(\Sigma)$ must be contained in it. $\square$

Now we want to study how many connected components $L(\Sigma)$ has.

Following [1] we define a space $\text{Map}(S^1, S(\Sigma))$. $S(\Sigma)$ is a spherical bundle associated with the tangent bundle of Σ . S^1 acts on $\text{Map}(S^1, S(\Sigma))$.

Proposition 3. *$L(\Sigma)$ is weakly homotopy equivalent to the Borel construction of $\text{Map}(S^1, S(\Sigma))$.*

This enables us to compute the number of connected components of $L(\Sigma)$.

We stick for a moment to the case of surfaces in 3 dimensional manifold. We state without the proof

Proposition 4. *The connected components of $L(\Sigma)$ are in one to one correspondence with elements of $\pi_1(S(\Sigma))$. It is $\mathbb{Z}_2$ in case $\Sigma = S^2$ and canonical central extension $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \pi_1(S(\Sigma)) \rightarrow \pi_1(\Sigma) \rightarrow 1$ of the fundamental group of a surface Σ .*

Observe that since we do care about orientation of curves in $L(\Sigma)$, we have two curves corresponding the underlying set of points.

3.2. Some Lagrangian subbundles of I . In 1.5 we defined a symplectic, complex vector bundle over $T^0(M)$ the compliment to the zero section of the tangent bundle.

Now we suppose that we have an embedding $i : \Sigma \rightarrow M$, Σ being a two dimensional hypersurface for M 3 dimensional or 4 dimensional isotropic submanifold of G_2 manifold M .

We pullback the bundle I on $T\Sigma^0$ via mapping

$$Di : T^0(\Sigma) \rightarrow T^0(M) \quad (4)$$

We end up with $Di^*(I)$. The claim is that Σ defines a Lagrangian subbundle in $Di^*(I)$. We pullback the tangent bundle $T\Sigma$ on $T^0(\Sigma)$ (and denote it by the same letters). To avoid complicated notations we denote the same letters the pullback of the tangent bundle TM on the compliment of the zero section in the tangent bundle $T^0(M)$. To define a Lagrangian subbundle we arrange the following mappings.

$$s : T\Sigma \rightarrow Di^*(TM) \rightarrow Di^*(I) \quad (5)$$

The Lagrangian subbundle $\mathcal{L}\Sigma$ is the image of the composite map s .

4. CALCULUS OF BUBBLES

4.1. The formulation of the problem. Let us suppose that we are in $\mathbb{R}^3$ we are given 2 spheres in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with oriented normal bundles. They intersect each other by a curve or a union of curve from the space $\tilde{Y}$. The intersection carries a canonical orientation. The question is when it is possible to separate those two spheres. In the process of separating them we want to keep spheres intersecting by the curve in $\tilde{Y}$.

Conjecture 1. *One can not separate two spheres, intersecting by a circle.*

Theorem 1. *Suppose that the process of separation is performed along good families of embeddings of spheres (see below), then one can not separate two spheres, intersecting by a circle.*

It is natural to formulate this problem in terms of infinite dimensional Lagrangian intersections. According to the previous sections every embedded oriented 2-sphere defines a Lagrangian submanifold consisting of two components. We pick the one where curves oriented counterclockwise. It is clear that curves in the intersections of spheres are exactly points of intersections of corresponding Lagrangian manifolds.

Our aim is to construct an invariant, similar to the index of intersection which would be invariant when we continuously deform one of the Lagrangian submanifolds.

4.2. Reminder of the basics of theory of finite dimensional Lagrangian intersections. According to [3] the story goes as follows. In finite dimensions we are given a symplectic manifold (M, ω) and two connected Lagrangian submanifolds L_1, L_2 . There are two definitions of intersection index. One is purely homological, it is the ordinary index of intersection. The other is defined using symplectic geometry. The former we want to generalize in infinite dimensions.

Suppose that Lagrangian submanifolds meet transversally at points $x, \dots, y$. We want to define Maslov index $m(x, y)$.

Define a space

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= \Omega(L, L_2) = \\ &= \{z \in \text{Map}([0, 1], M) \mid z(0) \in L_1 \text{ and } z(1) \in L_2\} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Constant maps in Ω correspond to points of intersection of L_1 and L_2 . Define a path in Ω between z_1 and z_2 as a smooth map

$$u : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow M \quad (7)$$

so that $u(t, 0) = z_1(t), u(t, 1) = z_2(t)$ and $u(0, t) \in L_1$ and $u(1, t) \in L_2$. In particular if z_1, z_2 are constant, u maps the boundary of $[0, 1]^2$ into $L_1 \cup L_2$ defining arcs in L_1 and L_2 connecting $x = \text{Im} z_1$ and $y = \text{Im} z_2$. In this situation Viterbo [4] defines an index by means of the Maslov class, i.e., the generator

$$\mu \in H^1(\Lambda_n, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z} \quad (8)$$

where $\Lambda_n \subset G(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ is the set of Lagrangian n -planes in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

Consider a pullback of the tangent bundle u^*TM . Since the base space $[0, 1]^2$ is contractible, we can define a trivialization

$$\Phi : u^*TM \rightarrow [0, 1]^2 \times \mathbb{C}^n \quad (9)$$

mapping the symplectic form on each fiber into standard form. Moreover, we can choose this trivialization so that it is constant on $\{0\} \times [0, 1]$ and on $\{1\} \times [0, 1]$, and so that $\Phi(T_x L_1) = iT_x L_2$ and $\Phi(T_y L_1) = iT_y L_2$. Then define $m_u(x, y)$ by evaluating the Maslov class over the closed loop

$$\partial[0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \Lambda_n \quad (10)$$

$$(\tau, 0) \rightarrow \Phi(T_{u(\tau, 0)} L_1) \quad (11)$$

$$(1, t) \rightarrow e^{\frac{i\pi}{2}t} \Phi(T_y L_1) \quad (12)$$

$$(\tau, 1) \rightarrow \Phi(T_{u(\tau, 1)} L_2) \quad (13)$$

$$(0, t) \rightarrow e^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}t} \Phi(T_x L_2) \quad (14)$$

5. RELATIVE(MASLOV) INDEX

We want to define Maslov index which would be relevant to infinite dimensional setting.

We are given 2 embedded two (four) dimensional isotropic oriented submanifolds Σ_1, Σ_2 , which are intersected transversally by two or more curves lying in

$\tilde{Y}$. We pick two curves γ_1, γ_2 from the intersection, which belong to the same connected components of $L(\Sigma_1)$ and $L(\Sigma_1)$.

As in 4.2 we pick two arcs, connecting γ_1, γ_2 in $L(\Sigma_1)$ and $L(\Sigma_2)$ respectively. We assume that there are no topological obstructions and there exist a map

$$u : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \tilde{Y} \quad (15)$$

whose restriction $u(t, 0)$ and $u(t, 1)$ are the mentioned above arcs. This map encodes a map of a handlebody

$$u^\# : [0, 1]^2 \times S^1 \rightarrow M \quad (16)$$

$u(t, 0, z)$ and $u(t, 1, z)$ are maps of cylinders into Σ_1 and Σ_2 respectively, while $u(0, t, z)$ and $u(1, t, z)$ do not depend on t . As it was mentioned in 1.5 for every value $0 \leq a, b \leq 1$ we have a map

$$u^\#(a, b) : S^1 \rightarrow T^0(M), \quad z \rightarrow u^\#(a, b, z) \quad (17)$$

and therefor

$$u^\# : [0, 1]^2 \times S^1 \rightarrow T^0(M) \quad (18)$$

We pullback the bundle I via $u^\#$ on $[0, 1]^2 \times S^1$. According to 1.5 in 3 and 7 dimensions bundle I carries a complex structure. This being said it becomes clear that $(u^\#)^*I$ is trivial. As in 4.2 we choose its trivialization

$$\Phi : (u^\#)^*I \rightarrow [0, 1]^2 \times S^1 \times \mathbb{C}^n \quad n = 1 \text{ or } 3 \quad (19)$$

mapping symplectic form on the fiber into standard form on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Moreover we chose this trivialization constant on $\{0\} \times [0, 1] \times S^1$ and $\{1\} \times [0, 1] \times S^1$. As we know (see 3.2) over $T^0(\Sigma)$ the bundle I has a Lagrangian subbundle $\mathcal{L}\Sigma$. Since the surfaces Σ_1 and Σ_2 are oriented then the restriction of each $\mathcal{L}\Sigma_\infty$ on $T^0(\Sigma)_1 \cap T^0(\Sigma)_2$ is trivial. We choose such trivialization Φ that

$$\Phi(\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty)) = \Phi(\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty)) \quad (20)$$

at $T^0(\Sigma)_1 \cap T^0(\Sigma)_2$.

Then we use the same formula as in 4.2 to define a map:

$$(\partial[0, 1]^2) \times S^1 \rightarrow \Lambda_n \quad n = 1, 3 \quad (21)$$

Observe that over points $[0, 1] \times \{0\} \times S^1$ and $[0, 1] \times \{1\} \times S^1$ of the base of the trivial bundle 19 we have two well defined Lagrangian subbundles. The mapping reads as :

$$(\tau, 0, z) \rightarrow \Phi(\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty)_{\cap(\tau, \cdot, \cdot)}) \quad (22)$$

$$(\tau, 1, z) \rightarrow \Phi(\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty)_{\cap(\tau, \cdot, \cdot)}) \quad (23)$$

Over the points $\{0\} \times [0, 1] \times S^1$ and $\{1\} \times [0, 1] \times S^1$ we want to employ the condition 20.

$$(1, t, z) \rightarrow e^{\frac{i\pi}{2}t} \Phi(\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty)_{\gamma_\infty}) \quad (24)$$

$$(0, t, z) \rightarrow e^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}t} \Phi(\mathcal{L}(\Sigma_\infty)_{\gamma_\infty}) \quad (25)$$

Observation The pairing of the Maslov class μ with a distinguished 1 cycle

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \{0\} \times \{0\} \times S^1 \\ &\subset (\partial[0, 1]^2) \times S^1 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

is not necessarily zero. Recall that we had a some freedom in the choice of trivialization 19. Namely the trivializations are homotopically classified by $\pi_0(\text{Map}([0, 1]^2 \times S^1, \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{n})))$, $n = 1, 3$. The last set is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. Since Σ_i ($i = 1, 2$) are oriented, we can always change trivialization $\mu(S)$ to become zero.

Now we are able to give the definition. Pick some cycle P , whose Poincaré pairing with S is one.

Definition 1. *The relative Maslov index of two curves $\gamma_i \subset \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2$ ($i = 1, 2$) is defined as $m(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \mu(P)$*

It should be clear that $m(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ doesn't depend on the particular choice of P .

5.1. Some properties of relative index. We want to explore the dependence of $m(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ on the choice of the map $u^\sharp$.

Now the dimension of the underlying manifold becomes essential.

Proposition 5. *If a manifold M is 3-dimensional the index $m(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is well defined mod(4).*

Proof. Suppose we have two maps u_1 and u_2 as in 15, that match on the boundary $\partial[0, 1]^2$. Together they define a map

$$u_1 \# u_2 : S^2 \rightarrow \tilde{Y} \quad (27)$$

Consider a pullback of a bundle $\tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$ on S^2 via the map $u_1 \# u_2$. Denote the total space of the pullback by $W_{u_1 \# u_2}$. Since $\text{Diff}^+(S^1)$ are homotopically equivalent to S^1 , the space $W_{u_1 \# u_2}$ is homotopically equivalent to either a lens space $S^3/\mathbb{Z}_n$ or $S^2 \times S^1$. The equivalence is carried out by replacing a curve by a curve with natural parametrization. Again we encode the map $u_1 \# u_2$, by a map:

$$(u_1 \# u_2)^\sharp : A \rightarrow M^3 \quad (28)$$

A stands for one of the lens space or $S^2 \times S^1$. As in 18 we define a map, denoted by the same letter as in 28, $(u_1 \# u_2)^\sharp : A \rightarrow T^0(M^3)$. It is clear that the domain of this map is sewed from the domains of $u_1^\sharp$ and $u_2^\sharp$ along a torus.

Let $I_{u_1 \# u_2}$ be a pullback of I on A . Observe $c_1(I_{u_1 \# u_2})$ is given as an element $\pi_0(\partial[0, 1]^2 \times S^1, \mathbb{C}^*)$, which defines a difference between trivializations Φ_{u_1} and Φ_{u_2} over $\partial[0, 1]^2 \times S^1$.

If A is a lens space then $c_1(I_{u_1 \# u_2}) = 0$ and there is no ambiguity in the definition of index.

If A is $S^2 \times S^1$ then $c_1(I_{u_1 \# u_2})$ might be nonzero. According to 3 $c_1(I_{u_1 \# u_2})$ is divisible by 2, another factor 2 due to the fact that natural map $U(n) \rightarrow \Lambda_n$ induces a multiplication by two in π_1 . $\square$

Proposition 6. *If M is G_2 manifold the index $m(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is well defined integer, depending on no choices.*

Proof. The discussion goes as in the proof of 5. In a due moment we use 4. $\square$

5.2. Definition of the invariant. Let us suppose that we have two oriented surfaces Σ_1, Σ_2 which intersect transversally by a link. We chose a maximal set of curves that lie in the same connected components of $L(\Sigma_1)$ and $L(\Sigma_2)$. We divide this set into two subsets: two curves belong to the same subset if their relative index is even and to different subset if it is odd. The difference of the cardinalities of these set is the invariant $T(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, a)$. By a we denote the class of curves from the same connected component of $L(\Sigma_1)$ and $L(\Sigma_2)$. The invariant is defined up to a sign.

We want to establish some kind of deformation invariance. It easy to construct a family of embedding of Σ_1 which violates conservation of $T(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, a)$. It is due to the fact that the total space $\tilde{Y}$ is not compact.

We discuss what are good deformations of a configuration Σ_1, Σ_2 . We keep an embedding $\phi : \Sigma_2 \rightarrow M$ fixed and vary the embedding of Σ_1 , $\varphi : [0, 1] \times \Sigma_1 \rightarrow M$ is the family of embeddings.

Definition 2. *A family of embedding φ is considered as good if for every value of $t_0 \in [0, 1]$, $Im(\phi \cap Im(\varphi(t_0, \cdot)))$ is a link and ϕ and φ are transversal.*

This definition implies that there is a finite set of critical values of $t \in [0, 1]$ for which ϕ and $\varphi(t, \cdot)$ are not transversal. For these values the images still must intersect by a link. As a result we have a simple local picture of critical intersection of two surfaces Σ_1 and Σ_2 along a knot γ . This configuration is diffeomorphic along γ to the following one: rotate a parabola $z = x(x - 2) + 1$ about z axis. The result is a surface Σ'_1 which is tangent to x, y plane (surface Σ'_2) at the points of intersection, which is a circle $x^2 + y^2 = 1$ (a knot γ'). Then we have a simple

Proposition 7. *The invariant $T(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, a)$ is preserved along good deformations.*

Proof. It is clear that we can suppose that interval $[0, 1]$ contains only one critical value of parameter t for φ . The direct computation shows that a pair of knots which annihilates at this critical value has odd relative index. $\square$

The proof of the theorem 1 now becomes obvious. It seems reasonable that to prove a similar theorem when two spheres intersect each other by large number of circles one has to develop some version of Floer complex.

6. COMPLEX STRUCTURE

We would like to go a little bit further and exhibit a quasi-complex structure, which exists on $\tilde{Y}$.

In 3 dimensions it was made in [1]. We want to do a similar thing for G_2 manifolds. According to section 3.1 we can canonically associate to the 3-form λ a Riemannian metric g and $(2, 1)$ tensor $[.]$. The tensor $[.]$ is an analog of the vector product in 3 dimensions. This being said the definition of the complex structure becomes a rephrasing of the one in [1]: we identify the tangent space to a point of $\tilde{Y}$, represented by a loop γ with a normal bundle to γ . Plugging tangent $\dot{\gamma}$ into $[.]$, get an operator $[\dot{\gamma}, .]$, acting in the normal bundle. The equation 3 secure that it square is $-id$. It is unclear to me if d^* closeness of λ implies integrability of the complex structure. It is more likely that it is always nonintegrable. Here are some evidence for it. Consider a simplest example

$M^7 = \mathbb{R}^7$. Instead of unparametrized space of loops take the unparametrized space of paths originating at the origin. This space carries a quasi-complex structure similar to the one described. There is a complex map of S^6 (with a classical quasi-complex structure) to the space of paths. A point on the sphere generate a ray through it. So the complex structure on the space of paths must be nonintegrable.

7. ONE HAMILTONIAN SYSTEM

On the space $\tilde{Y}$ associated with $\mathbb{R}^7$ there is a canonical function-the length of the curve. We want to understand better the structure of the corresponding Hamiltonian flow. It is known that the analog of this system in 3 dimensions is integrable. We convinced that in 7 dimensions integrability still holds, though we were unable to prove it. Here are some partial results

Proposition 8. *The system has three first integrals.*

Proof. Following [1] the Hamilton equations have form

$$\dot{\gamma}(z, t) = [\gamma'(z, t), \gamma(z, t)'] \quad (29)$$

We use the notations; z is the parameter on the circle, t stands for time, $\dot{}$ partial derivative with respect to t , $'$ partial derivative with respect to z . Introduce a new function $T = \gamma'$. Differentiating 29 with respect to z we get

$$\dot{T} = [T, T''] \quad (30)$$

A priori the value of the integral with a density (γ', γ') is conserved, Then we have an equality :

$$1/2(T', T')' = -\lambda(T, T', T'')'' \quad (31)$$

So $1/2(T', T')$ leads to a conservation law. The last density we have in mind is $\lambda(T, T', T'')$, it also leads to a conservation law. Of course we anticipate the recursion of the kind $\dot{P}_i = P'_{i+1}$ (P_i are conservation law), but we were unable to check it in full generality. Unfortunately the method which is used to prove a similar fact in 3 dimensions uses heavily Lie algebra structure of the vector product. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Jean-Luc Brylinski, *Loop spaces, characteristic classes and geometric quantization*, Progress in Mathematics, 107. Birkhauser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993.
- [2] R. Bryant, *Metrics with exceptional holonomy*, Ann. of Math. (2) 126 (1987), no. 3, 525–576.
- [3] A. Floer, *Relative Morse index for symplectic action*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, XLI (1987), no. 4, 393–408.
- [4] C Viterbo, *Intersection de sous-variétés lagrangiennes, fonctionnelles d'action et indices des systmes hamiltoniens*. (French) Bull. Soc. Math. France 115 (1987), no. 3, 361–390

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNY AT STONY BROOK, STONY BROOK, NY 11794-3651
E-mail address: mmoushev@math.sunysb.edu